

proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 216 submitted earlier today by Senators KERRY and BOND.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 216) to honor Milton D. Stewart for his years of service in the Office of Advocacy of the Small Business Administration.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. KERRY. Madam President, I speak in support of a sense of the Senate Resolution honoring the work and dedication of Milton D. Stewart, the first Chief Counsel for the Office of Advocacy at the U.S. Small Business Administration. Today, March 5, 2002 Milt turns 80 years-old and it is only fitting that we pass this Resolution in honor of his commitment to America's small businesses. I am pleased to say that this bi-partisan Resolution has been sponsored by myself and Ranking Member Bond, along with a great majority of the members of the Senate Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship. I am also pleased that this Resolution has been cleared for passage and I thank the floor staff for their quick work in facilitating passage of this Resolution.

One of the most highly successful innovations of the House and Senate Small Business Committees came twenty-six years ago with the creation of the Office of Advocacy within the Small Business Administration. This Office was established to represent and advance small business interests before other Federal agencies and even with Congress. Congress recognized the importance of small business to the competitiveness of the American economy and understood that government sometimes can get in the way of small businesses doing what they do best—creating jobs.

Advocacy has done a commendable job looking out for the interests of small business. It is, ironically, a government agency that has the task of making sure that other government agencies take into account the special problems and needs of small businesses as those agencies go about their rule-making activities. Over the years, Advocacy has had a great deal of success and its hand has been strengthened by further Congressional action, such as the Regulatory Flexibility Act in 1980 and the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act in 1996.

This success is due in no small part to the solid beginnings of the Office of Advocacy under the leadership of the very first Chief Counsel for Advocacy, Milton D. Stewart. Milt, in his tenure as Chief Counsel, laid the groundwork for the Regulatory Flexibility Act, the first White House Conference on Small Business, the Small Business Innovation Development Act, and many other programs that are now considered part of the core small business policy within this country.

He came by his small business roots honestly. He spent his youth in a family-owned small business begun and managed by his father and mother. Early on, he acquired great respect for the skill and courage of small business entrepreneurs. Later in his life, Milt served at one time or another as President of the National Association of Small Business Investment Companies, President of the National Small Business Association, and as President of the Small Business High Technology Institute.

Milt also had significant government service beginning with the Office of War Information during World War II. He was even a staff member of the original Senate Committee on Small Business. He served as special counsel to Governor Harriman of New York and to the New York State Thruway Authority. All of this preceded his tenure as the first Chief Counsel for Advocacy.

While he was Chief Counsel, his charisma and vision inspired many of those who worked with him to catch the "small business bug" and to direct their energies toward helping develop sound small business policy for our Nation. They, and we, owe Milt a deep debt of gratitude.

The Office of Advocacy is fortunate to have had such a sound beginning. Those of us who care deeply for small business policy recognized how crucial Advocacy has become to sound regulatory debate within our country. The Office is a sterling example of an experiment that worked and continues to work to this day.

Milt, who deserves all the best on his birthday, can certainly take pride in the legacy that he has left by setting all the precedents that made the Office of Advocacy what it is today—an effective voice promoting the best interests of small business within our government.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, the motion to reconsider be laid on the table, and any statements relating to the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 216) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 2002

Mr. REID. Madam President, I note the presence of the Senator from Ohio. I will make sure the Senator from Ohio, in this unanimous consent agreement, is allowed to speak in relation to S. 517. It is my understanding the Senator from Ohio wishes to make an opening statement on this most important bill.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business

today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 6; that following the prayer and the pledge, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate resume consideration of S. 517, the energy bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REID. Madam President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of the Senator from Ohio in relation to S. 517.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Ohio.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent to speak for as much time as I may need to read my opening statement on the underlying bill that will provide a national energy policy for our country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ENERGY

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, we are facing a problem that every other nation that we share the planet with hopes it will have some day. That is, our country's economic growth will soon outpace our supply of available energy.

The growth of both the high tech and advanced manufacturing sectors in America has created jobs and has created enormous opportunity for our people, and they have created a new demand for energy. One reason these industries have flourished in America is because we have the fuel they need to succeed. We have the "people" fuel, the skilled workers with committed hearts and hands; we have the "idea" fuel, the smart minds that dream big and can take ideas from the drawing board on to the street; and we have "good old-fashioned" fuel, inexpensive, reliable sources of energy that literally make everything move and connect and work.

Other nations have some of these pieces, but they rarely have all of them. That won't always be the case. The world is shrinking, and our competitors, strategic and otherwise, are in hot pursuit. What will we do to stay ahead? What will we do to fuel America's continued success?

Our future success will require us to produce more energy to keep up with the growing demand for it. How big will that demand be? Big. You can see from this chart that there is a large gap currently in terms of the domestic production of energy and consumption. In other words, this open space on this chart is a gap between what we produce domestically and what we consume.

According to the Department of Energy, we are going to have to increase by 30 percent the amount of energy produced by 2015 in order to meet the demand of this great Nation.

In 2000, America used more than 3.8 billion megawatt hours of electricity. The Department of Energy estimates that by 2020, the demand will rise to 5.43 billion megawatts a year, an increase of 1.63 billion. To meet that new demand, the DOE says it will take 1,300 new power plants or, quite simply, the lights will begin to dim on the American dream for a lot of people.

Let's remember, needing more energy is a great problem to have. It means we are creating jobs and we are creating opportunity. The American dream is our country's economic success. It is a gift bequeathed to this generation by generations of men and women who toiled before us.

We are the stewards of this gift. History will judge us based on what this generation of Americans does right now with this gift. Will we keep America's light of opportunity shining, or will we sleep through our watch and let the light flicker out?

I am thankful to the Majority Leader for keeping his word and bringing this issue to the floor of the Senate. However, I disagree with the way it came to the Senate, since the bill should have been considered and voted out of the Energy Committee, instead of being written on the floor of the Senate.

Still, the bill presented before us at least starts the process by laying the foundation and beginning the debate. It has many things worthy about it and many things that we can build upon.

This bill is a good start because, among other things, it encourages greater use of renewable sources of energy, sources which have little or no impact on the environment.

The bill also encourages the use of ethanol, a renewable gasoline additive that helps reduce auto emissions and makes the air cleaner for us and our children to breathe.

It starts the needed debate on reauthorizing the Price-Anderson Act, which is so vital to the future expansion of our nuclear energy industry. But there is much more that we need to do. I have introduced legislation to expand the Price-Anderson reauthorization to include commercial nuclear reactors, as it must, and I hope that we will be able to include it in this bill.

What concerns me about this bill, however, is it raises false hopes. It creates the expectation that it will solve our future energy crises, protect our energy security, and sustain American opportunities. In reality, it doesn't do this. The bill does start in several good directions, but then falls short and is silent on several other key issues, such as energy infrastructure and the need to reduce our dependency on foreign oil.

The majority's bill doesn't fully deliver what America needs, and I would

have to oppose it in its current form. I hope that, as we amend it, it is something that I can support and a majority of the Senate can support.

Our energy challenge demands from us the enactment of a comprehensive energy policy, the likes of which we have never seen before in this country. I think the Senator from Oklahoma, Mr. INHOFE, did a very good job in talking about the need for an energy policy. I have wanted one ever since I was mayor of the city of Cleveland in 1979, but in administration after administration, we never got one. Today, we have this golden opportunity to have an energy policy for the United States of America. It has to be a policy that harmonizes energy and environmental policies, acknowledging that the economy and the environment are vitally intertwined, a policy that broadens our base of energy resources to create stability, guarantee reasonable prices, and protect our national security—a policy that won't cause prices to spike, hurting particularly the elderly, disabled, and low-income families, and which won't cripple the engines of commerce that fund the research that will yield future environmental protection technologies—technologies that can be shared with developing nations who currently face severe environmental crises.

In terms of energy security, we need to reduce our reliance on foreign sources of energy. As I pointed out, the gap between what we consume and what we produce is being met by imports—imported oil, imported gas, and other energy sources that we bring into the United States.

As we have all learned in ways too horrific for words, the enemies of freedom will go to extreme lengths to attack our country. As we seek to protect our Nation's freedom of opportunity, we should not do it in ways that make America more vulnerable to these enemies of freedom. We must do everything we can to provide for our energy need from within our Nation's borders.

We are already far too dependent on foreign energy sources. Oil imports have risen from 1973, when we imported 35 percent of our oil, to 58 percent last year. Today, we even import oil from Iraq—750,000 barrels a day. Seven percent of our oil comes from Iraq—the same country over which we fly regular combat missions. Think about that: 7 percent of our oil comes from a country that the President has described as one of the three countries in the Axis of Evil.

The political climate in the Middle East region today is more volatile than at any other time in my memory. For the United States to be so dependent on this part of the world to meet such a large portion of our energy needs makes us extremely vulnerable to being held hostage for oil. If the enemies of our country were willing to take out the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, does anyone doubt that

if they had a chance to cut off, or even just disrupt, our energy supply, they would do it? There is no doubt. They would do it and we know it.

As we rely on our own strengths for the answers to the coming energy crisis, we see that no single source of domestic energy is sufficient to meet all of our Nation's needs. Though we are blessed with large reserves of coal, oil, natural gas, renewables, and nuclear fuel, no single energy source can single-handedly solve our problem. That means we have to broaden our base of energy sources. We simply cannot put all of our eggs in one basket. If we were some other nation, diversifying our energy supply might be a great challenge. But we have been blessed. God has blessed us with the resources to solve this problem.

One of our great untapped resources is nuclear energy. Over the past 40 years, we have seen how safe and reliable nuclear energy can be. We currently get 20 percent of our electricity from nuclear energy plants. But this is far below what some countries do. France derives 70 percent of its electricity from nuclear power; Sweden gets 39 percent; South Korea gets 41 percent; and Japan gets 34 percent.

What nuclear energy brings to the table, which is so positive is that it produces zero harmful air emissions. In fact, 40 years of solid waste from all of our Nation's 103 nuclear facilities would fit on a football field to a height of only 10 feet.

Since 1973, the use of nuclear energy has prevented 62 million tons of sulfur dioxide, a key component of acid rain, and 32 million tons of nitrogen oxide, a precursor to ozone, from being released in the atmosphere.

Reauthorizing the Price-Anderson program, which provides needed liability protection for the public's benefit, updating an outdated, duplicative licensing process and creating a permanent repository for nuclear waste, will make it possible for us to take full advantage of the incredible potential this clean energy source provides us. I am going to offer an amendment to help improve the licensing process to facilitate the construction of new nuclear facilities and also address the human capital crisis that is impacting the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I will be joined by the Senator from Louisiana, Senator LANDRIEU, in this effort.

The other energy source we should turn to more is coal. It is by far our most abundant and cheapest energy resource. Right now, we have enough coal to meet our country's energy needs for the next 250 years. Because coal is so inexpensive, we can provide our vital manufacturing sector with the electricity it needs at prices low enough so that after businesses pay their energy bills, they will still have something left over for other important needs like innovation and research. Just as nuclear energy's challenge is waste storage—and I am glad

we are going to debate the issue of nuclear waste storage at Yucca Mountain—coal's challenge is air emissions. Coal today is cleaner than ever before, but we need to make it even cleaner. We have the technologies available to do so. Coal's low cost makes research and installation of clean coal technology a viable investment. In addition, these technologies can be shared with emerging nations that are largely dependent on coal for electricity. We can help them learn from our experience and spare them future environmental challenges. With clean coal technology, and the incentives to guarantee it will be used, we can ensure that the more than two centuries worth of coal that we have available today can be used as an energy source.

Let's talk about natural gas. It is a key component in meeting our current and future energy needs as some 60 million American homes now use natural gas for heat. Natural gas also provides 15 percent of this Nation's electric power and nearly one-quarter of our total energy supply. These percentages are increasing because natural gas burns cleanly and because it is easier to achieve permits from the EPA for natural gas-powered electric generation facilities. In fact, it is estimated that nearly 95 percent of all new power plants are going to be using natural gas.

Even with this increased usage, production of natural gas has remained fairly stable, and to accommodate the growing demand, imports of natural gas have risen from 4.3 percent of consumption in 1981, to around 16 percent today.

To reduce our reliance on imports, we need to tap the estimated 40 percent of undiscovered natural gas that is located on lands owned by the Federal and State governments. Without this, we face steep price increases in natural gas at a time when we are becoming increasingly dependent upon it.

We saw what can happen with natural gas during last winter's especially cold temperatures. A sudden high demand caught us unprepared when supplies were low and prices shot through the roof, devastating the poor and the elderly. I will never forget holding a meeting in Cleveland with Catholic Charities, Lutheran Housing, and the Salvation Army where they presented the dramatic impact that high natural gas prices were having on the poor, the elderly, and the disabled.

We also need to be mindful that changes we make on energy policy that affect demand for natural gas directly impact on our competitive position in the world marketplace for plastics and fertilizer. In fact, the Ohio Corn Growers Association told me that the high cost of natural gas was impacting the cost of their fertilizer. They said that many of their farmers did not plant as much corn last year because of the high cost of fertilizer.

Right now in America, oil remains the primary source of energy. From

heating people's homes to firing energy plants to running our automobiles, it makes up the largest portion of our energy portfolio which keeps our economy humming.

Demand for oil is expected to grow at a constant rate of 1.5 percent per year through the year 2020. To meet that demand, we need to maximize the use of the more than 22 billion barrels of proven oil reserves the United States possesses. We also need to make oil extraction from mature oilfields more economical. The Senator from Oklahoma spoke very eloquently a few minutes ago about the oil that is available if we could only find an economical way to get at it.

Of course, during the consideration of this bill, we will debate an amendment to allow oil exploration in ANWR. We have the technology today to both use our Alaskan oil and protect the region's environment. The potential for new job creation is great, up to 735,000 jobs in a variety of fields, and the added production will help strengthen our energy self-reliance.

Let's turn to conservation. Conservation has proven very successful in reducing energy demand. By incorporating technological breakthroughs into the production of energy-efficient automobiles, high-efficiency homes, and more efficient appliances and machinery, conservation has succeeded in saving us tremendous amounts of money.

I get a little concerned when I hear people say we have not done enough in the area of conservation.

This chart shows that through energy conservation, we have had enormous savings of some \$2.5 trillion from 1972 to 1991. This is according to a 1995 Department of Energy report, which is the most up-to-date data we have available. One can see that we have committed this country to conservation, and it is making a big difference.

Legislation that I am working on with Senator LEVIN would encourage continued fuel conservation efforts in automobiles without the devastating blow to our automobile manufacturing jobs that a competing bill would cause. Our proposal would let the technical work of establishing new fuel conservation standards be completed by researchers at the National Highway Transportation and Safety Administration. These new standards would be established only after scientific analysis of the safety, environmental, economic, and efficiency factors involved, which is a more responsible approach than picking an arbitrary number out of thin air.

In the end, we can expect to see greater fuel efficiency without sacrificing safety or a devastating loss of auto worker jobs upon which the economies of many States depend. I can tell my colleagues that the economy in my State depends on it given the amount of auto manufacturing that goes on in Ohio.

I have heard from the United Auto Workers and from the major auto-

mobile manufacturers that the language in the majority's bill could actually cause disruption in the economy of that industry. There is another way to put in place standards that will still get the job done in terms of conservation.

Another avenue to focus on is renewable energy sources. We currently rely very little on renewable sources of energy. In fact, wind and solar together make up less than one-tenth of 1 percent of our current energy production, but they are expensive and they are heavily subsidized.

Nevertheless, we need to continue to invest in these forms of energy because they are so environmentally friendly and they contribute to meeting the requirement of national self-reliance.

On the other hand, we must also be realistic about our challenge. While a savings through conservation has reached more than \$2.5 trillion over 30 years, the inherent problems of renewable sources make it impossible for them to realize similar savings or fill the growing gap between demand and supply.

In addition, because renewables make up such a small piece of our overall energy picture today, we do not have the capacity to meet our needs in the timeframe we are facing. Right now, as this chart shows, they will not get the job done. However, their growth will come, and should continue to be supported with research funding.

The point I am making is renewables currently make up only about 8 percent of our consumption. Even if we protect them for 20 years, they by themselves will not get the job done in meeting our energy needs. When I am talking about renewables, I am talking about solar, wind, hydropower, biomass, waste, and wood.

In a recent meeting I had with General Motors in Detroit, I was told the company sees fuel cell technology becoming a viable source in the next 10 to 15 years. It is not science fiction to think that our children and grandchildren—it will probably be our grandchildren—will see a time when the roads are traveled by cars run on hydrogen and give off only water.

The majority's bill mandates minimum consumption requirements for renewables and civil penalties if those minimums are not met. We should not be clubbing people for noncompliance. We should be doing everything we can to encourage the adoption of new energy technologies.

Renewables and conservation need to be a bigger part of our new energy policy, but we must also be realistic about our challenge. These two strategies do not have the capacity to meet our growing energy needs in the timeframe we are facing. Anyone who says otherwise either does not know what they are talking about or they are being intellectually dishonest.

Too often I hear people say: All we need to do is use more solar and wind power and it will take care of the problem. Here are the facts. Here is solar

and wind—less than one-tenth of one percent currently. If we project it, solar and wind alone will not get the job done. We are going to need coal, oil, natural gas, nuclear and other sources of energy to meet the demands of the United States of America.

Another important issue we must address is infrastructure. As we develop these new energy sources, we must make sure we can get them to where the people need them. We saw this firsthand 2 years ago when prices for gasoline in the Midwest spiked. The freak combination of a shuttered refinery and a temporarily downed pipeline created a bottleneck that midwesterners paid for all summer long. Low-income Americans were hit especially hard at the pump, and trucking companies and airlines took a big beating.

That is why I introduced legislation last year to help streamline the permitting process for new energy facilities. I hope my legislation, S. 1590, can be added to this bill because I think it would enhance it and make it better.

The problem of distribution is especially critical to the northeastern States as they try to get additional natural gas supplies into their homes and businesses to meet a growing demand.

I encourage my colleagues from that part of the country to take a close look at my provision because I think it is something they should get behind.

The same technology which is helping to drive the demand for more energy has also equipped us with tools to provide that energy. Advanced slant drilling, super-efficient power plants, hyper-accurate seismic research, we have all of these because of our innovative high-tech research.

Technology has also given us new tools to protect our environment and public health, and we must take full advantage of these opportunities because we must be good stewards of what we have been given. I reject the arguments from those on either side of the debate who say we have to choose between the environment and the economy. We now know the success of each is linked. As I have said before, we have to harmonize our energy needs and our environmental needs if we are going to have an energy policy. Only with a thriving economy can we fund the research that will find new ways to protect the environment—the cradle for every living thing on this planet—and the world's ecosystems cannot sustain us if we do not have clean air and clean water.

A growing American economic capability is the only way we can do such things as fight our war on terrorism, provide a prescription drug benefit for seniors, save Social Security from bankruptcy, eliminate our national debt, and meet other financial challenges facing our country. We need to have a growing economy. We know the challenge. We must provide more energy to keep America going. We know we cannot keep relying on unstable foreign sources to do this. We know we have the resources domestically to meet our needs. We also know that doing this in an environmentally responsible way is critical. We know we have the technological know-how to meet these challenges.

The question that remains is whether or not Congress is going to stand in the way of this country's future success or whether we are going to be part of the solution. As we seek to provide our country the power to succeed, does this

body have the power to resist the temptation of partisanship and prove wrong those who say this debate will not end in the successful passage of a good bill? Do we have the courage to work together and do something good for our country and leave the partisan jabs and the hollow victories on the table?

I do not think it is going to be easy, but I think we can do that. I ask my colleagues to join in the constructive work of this body. Let us make it happen. I pray that the Holy Spirit inspires us to do it, for ourselves, for our children, our grandchildren and, yes, the world.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands adjourned until the hour of 10 a.m. tomorrow.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:13 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, March 6, 2002, at 10 a.m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 5, 2002:

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

Don V. Cogman, of Connecticut, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2006.

Katharine DeWitt, of Ohio, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2006.

Teresa Lozano Long, of Texas, to be a Member of the National Council on the Arts for a term expiring September 3, 2006.